

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **19 April 2007**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-30. Claims 1, 11, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-13, 15, 16, 18-23, 25, 26, and 28 -30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellison et al. (USPN 6,487,547 hereinafter "Ellison"), in view of Tedesco (USPN 7,058,622 hereinafter "Tedesco"). Claims 4, 14 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellison, in view of Tedesco, and further in view of Nilsen et al. (USPN 5,606,693 hereinafter "Nilsen").

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 because the use of the phrase "can be" makes the claims indefinite. Furthermore, Examiner rejects claims 1, 11, and 21 as being indefinite because of the term "if". Applicant has amended claims 1, 11, and 21 to eliminate the offending terms.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-13, 15, 16, 18-23, 25, 26, and 28 -30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellison, in view of Tedesco. With respect to claims 1, 11, and 21, Examiner states that while Ellison does not explicitly disclose:

Determining if the user is an enterprise user;

Querying the directory server for a user profile associated with the user;

Receiving the user profile from the directory server; and

Allocating resources to the user based on parameters specified in the user profile;

Tedesco discloses these elements. Furthermore, Examiner states that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Ellison and Tedesco to implement an embodiment of the present invention.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant respectfully points out that Tedesco teaches away from an embodiment of the present invention. Tedesco discloses the use of a “screening server 100” (Tedesco, FIG. 1-5) that is **external to** the database engine/server. In fact, Tedesco discloses “To maintain the integrity and operability of enterprise database systems, queries intended for a particular database engine are intercepted, preferably by a separate processing system, prior to be acted upon by the database engine” (Tedesco, abstract). All of the elements that Tedesco discloses are handled by the screening server prior to the database receiving the request. This is due to the fact that Tedesco is trying to reduce the load on the database server.

In contrast, an embodiment of the present invention handles all of these steps from within the database: “the system receives a request for resources from a user **at the database** and determines...” (Instant Application, paragraph [0011]). By performing these steps at the database, the embodiment of the present invention obviates the need for a screening server or any additional infrastructure. In the case of the embodiment of the present invention, the impact or load on the database server is not a consideration. The embodiment of the present invention has advantages over a system disclosed by Ellison and Tedesco because it does not require additional infrastructure.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 11, and 21 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-6 and 8-10, which depend upon claim 1, claims 12-16 and 18-20, which depend upon claim 11, and claims 22-26 and 28-30 which depend upon claim 21, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Anthony P. Jones/
Anthony P. Jones
Registration No. 59,521

Date: 19 June 2007

Anthony P. Jones
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1666
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: tony@parklegal.com